## Case 1:12-cr-00298-TPG Document 33 Filed 12/12/14 Page 1 of 15

ebc2sils kjc UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, New York, N.Y. S2 12 Cr. 298(TPG) 4 V. 5 ESFRAIN SILVA, 6 Defendant. ----x 7 8 November 12, 2014 12:10 p.m. 9 Before: 10 11 HON. THOMAS P. GRIESA, 12 District Judge 13 14 APPEARANCES 15 PREET BHARARA 16 United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York 17 BY: JASON A. MASIMORE Assistant United States Attorney 18 19 FEDERAL DEFENDERS OF NEW YORK Attorneys for Defendant 20 BY: PEGGY CROSS-GOLDENBERG 21 22 23 24 25

(Case called)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

MR. MASIMORE: Good afternoon, your Honor. Jason Masimore for the government.

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: Good morning, your Honor. Federal Defenders of New York by Peggy Cross-Goldenberg for Mr. Silva.

THE COURT: You have gone over the presentence materials with your client, have you not, Ms. Cross-Goldenberg.

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: What would you like to add this morning? Obviously the government's letter of yesterday is what it is, and if you would like to comment on that or whatever would you like to say, please go ahead. Why don't you keep seated and then the microphone will pick you up.

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: Thank you, your Honor.

Before I address the government's letter, I just have one or, actually, two corrections to the presentence report that the parties have noted. The first is that on the cover page, the year is wrong in the docket number and actually throughout the presentence report it has the year 2013 instead of 12.

THE COURT: What date is wrong, please?

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: It has the Docket S2 13 Cr.

298, and it should be 12 Cr. 298.

THE COURT: S2 12 Cr. 298, right?

```
1
              MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: Yes, your Honor.
 2
              THE COURT: That is corrected.
 3
              MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: On page five of the presentence
 4
      report, paragraph 16, I think it is implied, but I would like
 5
      it to be just a little bit clearer, that Mr. Silva withdrew the
6
      September 12 quilty plea and on August 19, he pled to Counts
 7
      One through Three of the superseding indictment. So I guess
      what I would insert in paragraph 16 in the last sentence after
8
9
     August 19, 2014, I would say "Silva withdrew his previously --
               THE COURT: Oh, yes, go ahead. I interrupted you. Go
10
11
      ahead.
12
              MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: I apologize.
13
              He withdrew his previously entered guilty plea and
14
     pleaded guilty to Counts One through Thirteen of S2 12 Cr. 298.
15
               THE COURT: Go a little slower. He withdrew his --
              MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: -- previously entered quilty
16
17
     plea --
18
               THE COURT: All right. And?
19
              MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: -- and pleaded quilty to counts
20
      One through Thirteen of S2 12 Cr. 298.
21
               THE COURT: He pleaded guilty to -- say that again?
22
              MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: Counts One through Thirteen.
23
              THE COURT: Did you say of?
24
              MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: Of S2, which is the superseding
25
      information 12 Cr. 298.
```

THE COURT: Could the government be in touch with the probation department and have these changes made? These are important changes. Would you do that?

MR. MASIMORE: Your Honor, we will work with the court to make that happen. I will speak to Mr. Beale and make sure probation is notified.

THE COURT: Okay. Very good.

You go ahead with whatever else you would like to say.

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: Thank you, your Honor.

Just to double check that the court has received my letter and the exhibits that were attached.

THE COURT: Right.

MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: So as the court knows, we have requested that the court impose a sentence of 46 months. We think that is sufficient to effect the statutory sentencing objectives here. Anything greater than that, your Honor, I think would be greater than necessary.

I note that the 46 months was the bottom of the guideline range in the original plea agreement, and that's where that number comes from. But 46 months, your Honor, is a long time. It is almost four years in jail, and especially at this point in Mr. Silva's life, you know, it is 46 months that a lot of people his age spend starting, finishing, and graduating from college, and instead he will be in jail.

The government's letter which I know the court has

received, which I found to be quite scathing in terms of a lot of personal things related to Mr. Silva and his family, I do think reinforces my point in terms of Mr. Silva's age and maturity and sort of how he got here.

I know the government's letter repeatedly attacks

Mr. Silva's friends and family as bad character witnesses and

asks the court to disregard their opinions. I find that very

unfortunate, because what they did in the video what, they

attempted to do at least, was give the court more insight into

Mr. Silva's life and what it has been like to be him and sort

of where he comes from. Then weren't acting as character

witnesses in the sense of trying to persuade the court that

Mr. Silva has never done anything wrong or has no problems.

And I think Mr. Silva would be the first one and in fact in the

video he was quite straightforward that he has problems. He

has made bad decisions. He characterized them as dumb

decisions. He has committed crimes.

So I am not asking the court to find that he is some sort of angel who doesn't deserve to be punished here. He knows that he is going to be punished. He knows that he will be punished severely.

But the question is, and I don't think this is addressed anywhere in the government's submission, is how do we move forward from here? You have a very young man. He was 18 years old when he first was arrested related to this case. He

was 19 years old at the MCC, the youngest person on his unit.

You know, the government attacks his mother, his sister, his girlfriend and tells the court that he needs to be removed from them for an extended period of time, and I just find it sort of heartbreaking. They are all that he has. You can't choose your family and certainly no family is perfect. They all fight and there are arguments. Mr. Silva's father abandoned him at a very young age, as we go into in our letter and as they discuss in the video. He suffered the death of one of his closest friends. He certainly has made bad choices. He ran with the group that was involved in this conspiracy and it was for no good reasons, and he understands that he needs to be punished for that. He has pled guilty and is here to accept responsibility for his actions.

But what he is left with are these women who I should point out to the court are here to support him today — his mother, his sister, his girl friend. They appear in the video. They wrote letters to the court. Certainly if you have questions for them, they are more than happy to answer them. But this is a young man who was institutionalized from a very young age. He was ten years old when he was first put into a juvenile home, and now he is 21. And the question is, Where does his life go from here? What will he do? How can he emerge from prison in a way that avoids us ever being here again?

And certainly a lengthy term of incarceration, he understands, is the consequence of his actions; but to keep him in jail until he is 30, you know, to rob him of an entire decade of his young adulthood when what he really needs is, and I think his girlfriend's mother summed this up as well as can be summed up at the end of the video that, you know, he needs an education, he needs therapy, maybe a psychologist, maybe medication, and he needs help, but he need as chance to become — to have those things and to become a man. And keeping him in prison for 78 months or 97 months, as the government requests, I think is simply too long, given all of the circumstances of this case.

As I have said, he was very straightforward in the video, I thought, where he explains that he makes bad decisions, for example, smoking marijuana while he was on bail, and he explains why did he it, right? He was trying to numb the pain that he was feeling and the stress that he was feeling about this case. And he realizes after the fact that it doesn't take away any pain. In fact, it adds pain. So he is in this cycle where his decisions are poor, they leave him worse off, and the question is how can that cycle be broken? And it is not by locking him up and throwing away the key and removing him from the only support, however imperfect the government may think it is, from the people who love him.

So I think, your Honor, in light of all of the facts

and circumstances of this case, a sentence of 46 months is sufficient to affect the statutory sentencing objectives. It protects the public. It gives him a chance for education and rehabilitation. It punishes him. It promotes respect for the law. Anything longer than that we start to actually be counterproductive, because it keeps him out of society and out of a chance to emerge from prison with a degree and a chance to start getting jobs while he is in his mid twenties as opposed to when he is in his thirties and he has got no work experience.

Your Honor, I would request that the court, whatever sentence the court imposes that, it recommend to the Bureau of Prisons that Mr. Silva participate in the residential drug and alcohol treatment program. I think we can all agree that that is something that he will benefit from and it is something that he has very much shown an interest in.

While he was at the MCC he did complete the short drug program that they have there. It is only 40 hours. There is no programming at the MDC, which is where he has been for the past year, so he hasn't been able to take any programs there. But I think, your Honor, we would request that the court impose that so that he can get a start on at least dealing with his substance abuse issues and his coping mechanism. Then hopefully, when he gets out, and he can continue to pursue his education, he will already have a foot on the right track.

So we ask that the court impose a sentence of 46 1 2 months with a recommendation that he be permitted to participate in the residential drug and alcohol program and 3 4 that he be housed in a facility as close to the New York City 5 area as possible. 6 Thank you, your Honor. 7 THE COURT: Would your client wish to make a statement? 8 9 MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: Yes he does, your Honor. 10 Should he remain seated as well? 11 THE COURT: Yes, please. 12 THE DEFENDANT: How you doing, your Honor? First, I 13 want to say sorry to my family. THE COURT: A little louder and a little slower. 14 15 THE DEFENDANT: How you doing? I want to say, first, I want to say sorry to my family for putting them through the 16 17 shame, and I want to say sorry to anybody's property I caused 18 damage to. 19 I know that I messed up growing up and the area was 20 hard for me, you know, but I am sorry for everything I have 21 done. I wish I could take everything back that I have done, 22 but it is too late now.

And I wish I could go back to a positive society now and go back to school and get a job.

23

24

25

THE COURT: Does the government have any statement?

MR. MASIMORE: Yes, your Honor. I think in the typical case it is probably difficult for a court when assessing a sentence to consider how much specific deterrence is necessary and how likely is it that a particular defendant is going to be a recidivist and therefore what type of sentence to craft to achieve goals related to those two qualities about a defendant.

I think in this case, the court doesn't have to really predict anything because the defendant has shown the court what the defendant is going to do. And from the inception in this case, from his arrest, from his being in prison for a bit, then out on bail, then back in, throughout the entire time he has demonstrated nothing but contempt for the process and contempt for the court.

Not only did he commit more crimes after he was arrested and after he spent some time in lockup, but he continually violated prison regulations. I think the letter, much of the letter seems scathing in the sense that I was reciting the facts of Mr. Silva's interaction with the court since his arrest. And I think those facts do indict him and they do convict him and they show very clearly in this case in the government's view that there is — it is necessary that a very significant sentence be imposed to deter Mr. Silva and to lessen the risk of him being a recidivist.

I don't think, under the guidelines range that's

proposed here, he would get out when he is 30. He is 21 years old now. He spent at least a year in. The low end of the guidelines range is six and a half years and if he successfully completes an RDAP program, as defense counsel suggests, which I think would probably be very appropriate for somebody with his problems, he will be out still in his early to mid twenties, not 30, which gives him plenty of time left.

But, your Honor, in this case, particularly where there are any number of codefendants in the Judge Carter case for the related conduct, the overall burglary and drug conspiracy case, watching what happens here, as well as members of the community, there needs to be a punishment here in relation to his behavior since he has been interacting with the court. I think the court is well aware of the crime and certainly the serious nature and circumstances of the case in that regard, but here what strikes me is his behavior since he has been arrested, and I don't think I have seen a case where somebody has had such a poor adjustment to being arrested and being under the court's authority.

The last thing I will say is there has been some argument about him wanting to get an education and him want to go get drug treatment. But he has already demonstrated that he is not it necessarily sincere in that regard, and what I am referring to is his repeated absences and latenesses to the GED program that he was given the opportunity by your Honor to take

advantage of. I recall that one of the reasons your Honor granted him bail notwithstanding his poor behavior was that he was going to work on his GED, and he took that and he threw that away by not going to the classes. In addition, he didn't support to substance abuse as he was required to do by Pretrial Services. So I think these words ring hollow and I think it is very important here for the court to give a guidelines sentence for these reasons.

THE COURT: Let's come to the sentence.

This case has some truly exceptional features in the acts of criminality. To point out one illustration, he was engaged in burglaries, probably not fully understood by the court, but he was and there was a time he was released on bail and he committed further burglaries while released on bail.

The government's letter, which I don't find challenged as to its credibility, the government's letter indicates a remarkable series of actions by Mr. Silva and disregard, complete disregard for the fact that he was on bail, he was being trusted. That's why people are put on bail. They are put on bail to be trusted, and he could not be trusted.

The underlying crime is serious, involving burglaries. The conclusion the court reaches is that there is no real basis for the court to depart from or to fail to use the guidelines. The guideline range is 78 to 97 months.

I am imposing a sentence of 84 months in prison on all

the counts, and those sentences are to be served concurrently.

Those prison sentences will be followed by supervised release terms of three years, all to be served concurrently.

There will be a \$100 special assessment for each count, starting with the Count One, the conspiracy count, and Counts Two through Thirteen, the substantive burglary counts.

And of course I think it is clear from the sentence that I am imposing sentence on Counts One and Two through Thirteen, that the 84-month sentences are on each of those counts to be served concurrently. The supervised release term of three years is on each of those counts to be served concurrently.

I assume there has been no waiver of a right of appeal. What about that?

MR. MASIMORE: There is a waiver of the right to appeal between the guidelines range; although, to the extent the defendant retains any right to appeal for any reason, defendant should be aware that the court would appoint an attorney to file and prosecute such appeal if the defendant has a right to do so.

THE COURT: Under the sentence that I am imposing, is there a waiver in the plea agreement? Is there a waiver of a right of appeal?

MR. MASIMORE: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

In connection with any other rights that he has, of course he can pursue, and the court-appointed attorney will function.

I think that concludes everything we need to do. Is there anything else?

MR. MASIMORE: Your Honor, just a few housekeeping matters.

I guess with respect to the forfeiture, the court previously entered a preliminary order of forfeiture with respect to \$190,000. That is 190,000 in U.S. currency as well as the interest in some automobiles. I think the court as a technical matter needs to pronounce that as part of the sentence now.

THE COURT: Yes. I so order.

MR. MASIMORE: In addition, your Honor, and I think it is implicit, but the court should, if it wants to, adopt the presentence report.

THE COURT: I adopt the findings of the presentence report.

MR. MASIMORE: And your Honor at this time the government moves to dismiss any open counts.

THE COURT: Motion granted.

MR. MASIMORE: And lastly, the conditions of supervised release are those that are set forth in the presentence investigation report.

THE COURT: Of course. 1 2 MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: Your Honor, from us, just with 3 respect to the drug and alcohol program and --THE COURT: Right. The judgment will include a 4 recommendation for the drug and alcohol program. Of course it 5 will. 6 7 MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: Thank you, your Honor. And also that he be housed as close to New York City at possible. 8 9 THE COURT: I will so recommend. 10 MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: Thank you, your Honor. 11 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. That concludes our 12 proceeding. 13 MR. MASIMORE: Thank you, Judge. 14 MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: And I don't know if the court has another matter right after this, but can he just talk to 15 his family from the bar for a minute before he goes in the 16 17 back? THE COURT: Of course, of course, of course. 18 19 MS. CROSS-GOLDENBERG: Thank you. 20 21 22 23 24 25